

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

Ariel Acevedo,

Case No. 15-cv-2045

Petitioner

v.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

R. Hanson,

Respondent

Before me is the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge George J. Limbert filed on July 14, 2017, in the above-entitled action. (Doc. No. 8). Under the relevant statute:

Within [fourteen (14)] days after being served a copy of these proposed Findings and Recommendation, any party who wishes to object must file and serve written objections or further appeal is waived.

*United States v. Campbell*, 261 F.3d 628, 631-32 (6th Cir. 2001) (citation omitted); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (effective Dec. 1, 2009); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). In this case, the fourteen day period has elapsed and no objections have been filed.

The failure to file written objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation constitutes a waiver of a determination by the district court of an issue covered in the report.

*Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

Following review of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, I adopt the Report and Recommendation in its entirety as the Order of the Court. (Doc. No. 8). Accordingly, the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is dismissed with prejudice. (Doc. No. 1). Further, I certify, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal of this decision could not be taken in good faith, and that there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability.

So Ordered.

s/ Jeffrey J. Helmick  
United States District Judge